DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 121 HE 018 173

AUTHOR Ye, Byung W.
TITLE The Ivy Melting Pot: A Progress Report.
PUB DATE 31 May 84
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Admission; *College Choice; College Graduates; College Students; Comparative Analysis; Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Prestige; *Private Colleges; Questionnaires; *Selective Colleges; *Student Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS Brown University RI; Cornell University NY; Dartmouth College NH; Harvard University MA; *Ivy League Colleges; Princeton University NJ; University of Pennsylvania; Yale University CT

ABSTRACT

Minority recruitment and admissions at seven Ivy League colleges was studied: Brown, Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, and Yale. The questionnaire, which is appended, collected information on recruitment policies and number of applicants, acceptances, and matriculants from fall 1978 to spring 1983. Each college targeted their recruitment efforts to specific minority groups. Brown, Harvard, Yale, and Pennsylvania experienced a steady increase in minority applications, while Cornell's rate fluctuated. On the average, 13 to 16 percent of the colleges' applications each year were from the targeted minority group. The colleges on the average accepted about 4.5 of minority applicants from the overall applicant pool yearly. While Pennsylvania and Brown had a steady, increased rate of minority acceptances, Harvard had the highest acceptance rate, and Dartmouth had the lowest. Harvard also had the highest minority matriculation rate. Three factors that may be significant in minority recruitment are geographic location, recruitment activities, and better integration. It is speculated that minority acceptance/matriculation rates are approaching a plateau. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED255121

The Ivy Melting Pot: A Progress Report

BYUNG W. YE

Department of Education
Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH 03755

May 31, 1984

HE 01823

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Byung W. Ye

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Ivy League was formally organized in 1954 by eight academically and socially prestigious institutions in the eastern United States primarily for the purpose of fostering amateurism in athletics.[2] The eight founding institutions were Brown University, Columbia College, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard and Radcliffe Colleges, Princeton University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Yale University. Over the years the league has diversified considerably in the number of ethnic minrities represented. Today the participating institutions meet regularly to discuss not only athletics but also academics, educational philosophy, and "procedures in admissions."[3]

The college admissions process in the United States has changed significantly since the mid-1960's when the predominantly white institutions across the country began to recruit minority students.[4] The Ivy institutions promote a non-discriminatory admissions policy that assures equal opportunity for all applicants regardless of sex, race, color, creed, ethnic origin, or physical handicap. Moreover, each Ivy school makes a strong effort to recruit ethnic minorities; in fact, each institution competes with others to attract qualified minority students in order to achieve a diverse student body.

BEST COPY

Examining the minority recruitment process in the Ivy League will provide some answers and suggestions as to what the members of the league can do to improve and strengthen recruitment programs. This study can provide invaluable information to each institution regarding where it stands relative to other schools in the league. Does one institution attract more ethnic minorities to apply than the others? Does one college admit more of these minorities than the others? Does one school attract more minorities to matriculate than the others? These are some of the questions that the author hopes to answer. The author would also like to make the eight Ivy League institutions aware of the changes that have taken place in minority admissions over the past five years. Finally, this seminar report is intended to provide both quantitative and qualitative information about minority recruiting in the Ivy League.

Since the mid-1960's, when the colleges and universities in the United States began to recruit ethnic minorities, many articles, books, and research reports have been written on minority admissions. Literature ranges from broad topics such as affirmative action and reverse-discrmination to specific categories such as minorities in predominantly white institutions.

BEST COPY

Williams (1982) compared the admissions criteria for minority students across different types of institutions (e.g. public, private, four-year, two-year, etc.) in the United States. He determined that the private universities appear more likely to identify ethnic minorities for admissions purposes. Although Williams' research concentrated on admissions criteria such as class rank, Grade Point Average, etc. his findings on the factors that impede private colleges' recruitment of minority students are worth highlighting. He found that "factors such as image, cost, and location may be the major impediments to private colleges' recruitment to minority students."[5]

The major factors that determine the admission and enrollment of minority student at state universities in Ohio could be found in Miller's article (1977). His studies assessed the minority recruitment and retention efforts at the state universities in Ohio. He asserted that institutional characteristics such as geographic location, large minority population, academic and cultural programming services for minority students can affect the minority student recruitment and enrollment.

An article by Astin (1977) analyzed the characteristics of entering freshmen in predominantly black and predominantly white institutions. Astin's study focused on age, high school preparation, financial aid, attending institution, parental income, and academic achievements of the entering black freshmen in the predominantly black and predominantly white institutions.

BEST COPY

Of all her findings, it is particularly note-worthy that "more blacks attend institutions closer to home than do whites."[6]

Sedlacek (1976) examined the admissions criteria and enrollment for minority students at large, predominantly white universities in the United States. In his research a study of enrollment patterns for the minority students was of particular interest. Sedlacek found that the enrollment of entering freshmen varies from one geographic region to another. He noted that in 1975 the national average of black freshmen enrollment and of non-black minority enrollment were 5% and 3.7%, respectively.[7] Sedlacek also inferred from his study "the strong possibility that we may have reached a plateau" of minority enrollment in the large, predominantly white universities in the United States.[8]

Carr's study (1979) pointed out positive non-academic factors that influence the recruitment and retention of "other race" students at Virginia's state colleges: It is worth noting that "the non-academic activities aimed to recruitment and admissions indicate that the major objective ... is the recruitment of other race students."[9]. Carr also commented on black students at traditionally white institutions such as Ivy League schools and follows up on Puttkammer's 1962 article.

In his article, "Negroes in the Ivy League," Puttkammer (1962) compared six of the eight Ivy League universities, leaving out Penn and Cornell. He compared the influence of recruitment and retention of black students in the six institutions with

BEST COPY

respect to tradition, community, and admissions procedures. Analyzing the Ivy colleges, with particular emphasis on Harvard and Princeton (his own institution), Puttkammer explained that each college considered in his study is "aware of almost every one of their Negro candidates and inevitably give each special consideration."[10]

The articles so far presented concerns one minority group, namely Blacks. However, we must not exclude other minority groups. In the past decade many Asians, Hispanics, and other ethnic minorities have entered the United States. Moreover, in many parts of the United States, both the black population and the non-black minority population have increased significantly. Because there exists competition among the applicants vying for acceptance into the Ivy League institutions and because there also exists competition among the Ivy League institutions to recruit qualified ethnic minority students, there needs to be an objective study on this matter. In this seminar research the author will consider "ethnic minorities" as a whole and hopefully will provide some information about "ethnic minority recruiting" on the Ivy League campuses in the last five years.[11]

It was hypothesized by the author that the large, urban Ivy League institutions would attract more ethnic minority students to apply and to matriculate than the small, rural Ivy League

BEST COPY

institutions. Furthermore, the large, urban Ivy institutions can be more selective in choosing among the already "qualified" minority students than the small, rural Ivy institutions since the larger Ivies would have a higher number of minority applicants from which to choose.

Prior to the development of the questionnaire, the author sought professional advice from Alfred Quirk, Dean of Dartmouth College Admissions and Financial Aid. A questionnaire concerning the minority recruitment process and the athletic recruitment process was developed from the questions posed by the author and from the advice given by Dean Quirk. (The author's original research proposal consisted of a comparative analysis of minority and athletic recruitment processes in the Ivy League. However, due to insufficient data, only minority recruitment was reviewed in detail.) The questionnaire was reviewed and inspected by classmates in the seminar; instructor, Professor Mitchell; and Dean Quirk. The study sample consisted of the eight Ivy League insitutions.

The questionnaire was composed of two sections: minority recruitment and athletic recruitment. Both sections were structured identically. The questions on the survey were designed to provide specific answers on the recruitment policy. Each section was two-fold: first, the questionnaire asked general "yes-no" questions regarding the recruitment policy; then the second half asked the institution to quantify its recruitment

BEST COPY

policy by providing the number of applicants, acceptances, and matriculants for five academic years from the Fall of 1978 to the Spring of 1983.

Unlike non-Ivy institutions across the country, the Ivy institutions provide financial assistance to their students "solely on the basis of demonstrated need."[12] When a student is considered for admission, the Ivy istitutions give no special attention to the financial status of the applicant. Because financial aid has no direct affect on the recruitment of ethnic minorities for all Ivy colleges, it is not a factor of the recruitment policy considered. By excluding the "financial aid" factor, the research design is now much simpler than before. Thus, the questionnaire can be employed to find solely the actual recruitment policy that is not screened by the external factors like financial aid. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

On April 28, 1984 the dean or the director of admissions at each of the eight Ivy institutions was sent the following: a cover letter explaining the details of the study, a letter of recommendation from Professor Mitchell and a questionnaire concerning minority and athletic recruitment at the eight Ivy institutions. One week later a letter of recommendation from Dean Quirk was sent out to the eight deans or directors of admissions. Several follow-up telephone calls were made to the each admissions office from May 11 to May 25.

BEST COPY

All eight institutions replied. Seven institutions agreed to participate in the study by returning the completed questionnaire, but Columbia declined to participate emphasizing that the information requested was confidential. A refusal note by Mr. James McMenamin, Director of Admissions at Columbia College can be found in Appendix B.

The data received from the seven institutions concerning minority recruitment were very complete; however, several institutions could not provide sufficient data concerning athletic recruitment. In these schools, athletic recruitment is handled by the admissions and athletic department or by the athletic department alone. Due to the time constraint on the author's part, athletic directors were not reached to obtain all the information on athletic recruitment.

All seven of the eight Ivy institutions that participated in the study have replied that they actively recruit ethnic minorities of some type. Furthermore, all seven institutions have admissions officers primarily responsible for recruiting minority students. Indeed, there are recruiting officers for each ethnic groups pursued. For example, Dartmouth has two officers to recruit two specific ethnic groups. Princeton likewise has recruiting officers for each ethnic group it tries to attract.

BEST COPY

What follows is the analysis of the minority recruitment data in the Ivy League. Because each institution's size and characteristics are unique, direct numerical comparison cannot be made. Therefore, comparison must be made through relative percentages of recruitment, acceptance, and matriculation rates. There was no statistical programs used to interpret data since the study sample was limited to seven.

Unfortunately, not every ethnic minority group is recruited at each institution. Although Blacks are recruited by each institution, Asians and Hispanics are not recruited by Dartmouth. Dartmouth, however, does recruit disadvantaged New Englanders identified as the "North Country Disadvantaged" due to high "North Country" population in New Hampshire and surrounding regions. Brown does not recruit Native Americans, but due to the high Portuguese population in Providence and the vicinity, does recruit Portuguese students.[13] Penn recruits Chicanos and Latinos in addition to the four ethnic groups mentioned thus far. Table 1 below outlines the ethnic groups recruited by each Ivy institution.

Key : BR = Brown
CR = Cornell
DT = Dartmouth
HR = Harvard
PR = Princeton
PN = Penn
YL = Yale

BEST COPY

Table 1 : Minority groups recruited

	Blacks	Asians	Nat. Ams.	Hispanics	Other
BR	*	*		*	Portuguese
CR	*	*	*	*	
DT	*		*		
HR	*	*	*	*	
PR	*	*	*	*	
PN	*	*	*	*	Latino,Chicano
YL	*	*	*	*	

For the past five academic years, most league institutions have experienced fluctuation in the number of applications received. This can be seen in Appendix C. For several institutions an increase in the recruitment of ethnic minorities is evident. Brown, Harvard, Penn, and Yale have experienced a steady increase in their minority applications. Minority applications at Cornell have gone up and down from one year to another. Dartmouth has seen very little change in the number of minority applications for the past five academic years. On the average the Ivy League as a whole receives approximately 13% to 16% of its applications each year from the ethnic minority groups recruited. (table 2)

Table 2: % of minorities recruited in the applicant pool

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
BR	12.07	12.77	17.09	18.19	19.14
CR		17.71	21.89	18.12	18.88
DT	6.64	5.76	6.47	6.12	6.03
HR	15.20	17.49	18.58	20.09	22.56
PR	11.39	12.28	13.62	14.89	17.20
PN	13.92	15.65	16.65	17.57	18.41
YL	10.31	11.26	12.54	11.48	13.77
AVG		13.13	15.26	15.25	16.57

** (minority recruited/total applied)

BEST COPY

Table 3: % of total acceptance in the total applicant pool

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
BR	23.51	21.18	21.74	22.31	20.26
CR		32.08	31.56	31.02	32.10
DT	22.86	22.48	22.65	22.18	22.34
HR	17.30	15.52	16.01	17.36	18.30
PR	20.04	19.74	17.38	17.53	19.31
PN	42.97	40.74	39.40	43.50	43.24
YL	22.37	20.67	19.99	19.85	21.76
AVG		24.63	20.87	24.82	25.33

**(total accepted/total applied)

As one can see from table 3, Ivy institutions are very selective in admitting already qualified group of applicants. For example in the 1979-1980 academic year, only 15.52% of all applicants were admitted to Harvard. However, this is not always the case. Acceptance figures (%) vary (only to a small degree) from one academic year to another and from one academic institution to another depending on how many applications were received. Because each college or university has only a limited number of spaces in its entering class, it can only admit a certain percentage of applicants. If there is an increase in the number of applications (e.g. Brown in 1982-1983 academic year), the percentage of acceptances goes down though the number admitted remains virtually the same each year. This can be seen clearly by comparing the figures from Appendix C and from table 3.

The percentage of ethnic minorities accepted from the entire applicant pool remains steady for all institutions varying only

BEST COPY

slightly for each years. Penn usually accepts the highest percentage of minorities each year (except in 1980-81 when Cornell did). Penn accepts approximately 7% ± 1% of minority applicants from the entire applicant pool. The insitution that accepts lowest percentage of minority applicants is Dartmouth. Dartmouth accepts approximately 2.5% ± .5% of its minority applicants from the entire pool each year. The Ivy League on the average accepts approximately 4.5% of minority applicants from the over-all applicant pool each year. Please see table 4 for details.

The above analysis provides only the magnitude of acceptance rates. It, however, does not provide either minority representation in the acceptance pool or a clear picture of the changes that take place in minority acceptance rates. Does the minority acceptance rate actually remain constance in the Ivy League? Because the number of minority students accepted compared to the total number of applicants is very small, we cannot see a pattern of minority acceptance and representation clearly. Therefore, we must compare the total number of minority students accepted with the total number of students accepted.

Table 4: % of accepted minorities in the total applicant pool

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
BR	3.75	3.51	4.09	4.42	4.10
CR		6.09	6.92	6.17	6.17
DT	2.79	3.00	2.60	2.03	2.40
HR	3.47	3.28	3.64	3.61	4.05
PR	3.98	3.86	3.41	3.80	3.87
PN	6.41	6.27	6.42	8.31	8.00
YL	3.99	4.06	3.93	3.61	4.25
AVG		4.30	4.43	4.56	4.69

**(minority acc./total applied)

BEST COPY

Table 5: % of total minorities in the acceptance pool

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
BR	15.93	16.59	18.82	19.81	20.22
CR		18.99	21.92	19.90	19.23
DT	11.69	13.36	11.47	9.16	10.75
HR	20.06	21.16	22.74	20.77	22.15
PR	19.86	19.57	19.59	21.65	20.05
PN	14.91	15.38	16.30	19.10	18.49
YL	17.84	19.62	19.67	18.18	19.52
AVG		17.81	18.64	18.37	18.63

**(minority acc./total acc.)

From table 5 it is clear that Brown and Penn have experienced steady increase in the representation of minorities in the acceptance pool. Other institutions see only a small changes (both up and down). This analysis also provides another valuable information. It shows that Harvard has the highest representation of ethnic minorities in the acceptance pool--a little more than a fifth of its students come from minority groups. other hand, Dartmouth has the lowest representation of ethnic minorities in its acceptance pool. On the whole, a little less than a fifth of Ivy acceptances are ethnic minorities.

Table 6 shows the rate at which minority students are accepted from the minority applicant pool. The rate at which non-minority students are accepted from the non-minority applicant pool is shown in table 7. It is evident that the percentage of accepted minority students in minority pool is greater than the percentage of non-minority students accepted in

BEST COPY

non-minority group. However, the rate of minority acceptance is declining.

Table 6: % of minorities accepted from the total number of minorities applied

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
BR	31.03	27.52	23.94	24.30	21.40
CR	35.44	36.45	31.60	33.50	32.69
DT	41.99	52.18	40.15	33.20	39.83
HR	22.83	18.78	19.59	17.95	17.96
PR	34.94	31.45	25.00	25.48	22.52
PN	46.02	40.09	38.56	47.23	43.44
YL	38.72	36.03	31.36	31.46	30.85
AVG	35.85	34.64	30.03	30.45	29.81

**(minority accepted/minority applied)

Table 7: % of non-minorities accepted from the total number of non-minorities applied

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
BR	22.48	20.25	21.29	21.87	19.99
CR		31.20	31.55	30.46	31.96
DT	22.57	20.67	21.44	21.46	21.21
HR	16.30	14.83	15.20	17.21	18.40
PR	18.13	18.10	16.17	15.14	18.65
PN	42.47	40.87	39.56	42.70	43.20
YL	20.49	18.72	18.36	18.35	20.31
AVG		23.52	23.37	24.03	24.82

**(non-minority acc./non-minority app.)

When the selection process is finally completed, in mid-April the accepted students must decide which institution to attend in the coming Fall. Analysis of matriculation figures (table 8) shows that Harvard clearly leads all other schools with approximately three quarters of its accepted students matriculating. Penn has the lowest matriculation rate among the seven Ivies surveyed. The matriculation rate for all institutions is very steady with a variance of but a few percentage points from one year to another. For the Ivy League as a whole, an average matriculation rate of 55% is observed.

Minority matriculation in the total matriculation pool (table 9) shows that Harvard is once again favored by minority students. Annually an average of one fifth of an entering class at Harvard is ethnic minority students. Although Dartmouth has

BEST COPY

the second (or third depending on an academic year considered) highest rate of matriculation in the Ivies, the percentage of minority representation in the entering class is the lowest in the Ivy League and is not increasing steadily. There is a steady increase in the rate of minority matriculation at Brown and at

Table 8: % of total matriculated from total applied

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
BR	48.69	50.89	50.31	52.31	51.78
CR		52.24	52.94	50.35	48.14
DT	58.56	56.41	57.06	57.45	59.07
HR	74.11	75.81	73.80	69.78	70.14
PR	51.57	55.99	56.60	55.76	54.97
PN	48.50	47.31	46.36	45.80	45.56
YL	55.53	59.01	59.29	59.25	58.05
AVG		56.81	56.62	55.81	55.39

**(total matriculated/total accepted)

Table 9: % of minorities matriculated in the total matriculation pool

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
BR	12.98	15.88	16.65	16.39	17.16
CR		18.46	21.53	19.44	18.77
DT	8.08	10.47	10.24	6.60	8.82
HR	20.51	21.29	22.98	21.29	21.07
PR	18.73	14.13	14.55	19.24	15.75
PN	10.03	13.44	13.34	16.76	16.12
YL	13.87	17.03	17.36	15.50	14.66
AVG		15.81	16.66	16.46	16.05

**(total min. mat./total mat.)

Penn. The rate of minority matriculation fluctuates from one year to another and from one institution to another. The peak years in minority matriculation rate at Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, and Yale are 1979-80 and 1980-81. There is a dramatic drop of minority matriculation rate in above academic years at Princeton.

Important as it is to analyze minority representation in the entering class, it is as important to consider the numerical value that represents the fraction of the minority acceptees who decided to matriculate at each of the seven institutions. From table 10 we can deduce that approximately half or just less than

BEST COPY

a half of those accepted choose to matriculate at any of the six institutions. Harvard is the exception. Unlike the rest of the league institutions, approximately three quarters of the minorities accepted choose to enter Harvard. For the six other institutions there is a fluctuation in the rate of matriculation from one year to another.

Table 10: % of minorities matriculated from the total minorities accepted

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
BR	39.67	48.69	44.54	43.27	43.93
CR	38.42	50.77	52.00	49.19	46.98
DT	40.47	44.22	50.94	41.42	48.44
HR	75.77	76.26	74.59	71.52	66.73
PR	48.64	40.43	42.03	49.55	43.19
PN	42.38	41.36	37.95	40.21	39.72
YL	43.17	51.20	52.33	50.50	43.60
AVG	46.93	50.42	50.63	49.38	47.51

**(total min. mat/total min. acc.)

Table 11: % of non-minorities matriculated from the total non-minorities accepted

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
BR	50.40	51.32	51.67	54.54	53.78
CR		52.58	53.20	50.64	48.41
DT	60.96	58.29	57.85	59.07	60.35
HR	73.69	75.69	73.57	69.32	71.11
PR	52.30	59.78	60.15	57.50	57.92
PN	49.57	48.39	48.00	47.12	46.88
YL	58.21	60.92	60.99	61.20	61.55
AVG		58.14	57.92	57.06	57.14

**(total non-min. mat./total non-min. acc.)

Even for non-minority students who are accepted, Harvard has the highest rate of matriculation. (table 11) The matriculation rate for non-minority students at each of the seven institutions for the past five years show the following order (from the highest to the lowest rates of matriculation): Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Princeton, Brown and Cornell, and Penn. However, there is no clear cut order for the minority matriculation rate.

BEST COPY

What do the above results mean? It is now time to consider the factors causing or relating to the interesting results that we have seen.

In his studies of state universities in Ohio, Miller(1977) found that institutions located in urban areas have a higher rate of minority representation than schools that are distant from a large cultural center. A similar observation can be made in the Ivy League. Brown, Harvard, Penn, and Yale, colleges located near large cultural centers, have experienced a steady increase in minority applications. There is an exception to Miller's study. Princeton, for the last five years, has also received an increase in the number of applications from minorities. The Princeton case illustrates that an increase in the minority application rate is not due solely to the location of the institution. An increase in the Ivies is suspected to be the result of intense recruiting and increase in diversity and integration of the student body at each of the above schools. Each of the seven institutions have recruiting officers primarily responsible for pursuing each ethnic group that the school is interested in (as listed on table 1). Many special activities are also planned for minorities by these colleges. For example, when the author was identified as a minority applicant at Brown, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, invitations to special activities such as a reception and information sessions were received.

BEST COPY

These activities, in the eyes of an applicant, suggest that the college is paying special attention to the minorities thereby drawing more minority applicants in future years.

These universities are also in a more favorable position to recruit more minorities because they are better integrated than a small, partially integrated college like Dartmouth. It is much harder for a rural, small college to appeal to minorities. In minority student's view, it is risky to apply to a predominantly white institution that is distant from a cultural center and where the rate of ethnic integration is changing very slowly. For Dartmouth, recruitment of only two minority groups has hurt the school's chance of attracting other minorities. Perhaps Dartmouth should recruit Asians and Hispanics in addition to the Blacks and Native Americans it presently recruits. The presence of other ethnic groups on campus and other ethnic graduates off-campus promoting the school encourages many minority students to become attracted to the college and apply for admission.

Although Cornell is located in a rural area, it attracts more minority students to apply for admission than any other Ivy college. Of course, the size of the university (largest in the Ivy League) does help in the recruitment process. Note the characteristic that Cornell as well as Princeton is distant from cultural centers. Cornell is the largest and Princeton the second smallest school in the Ivy League. But both institutions seem to attract a high number of minority students each year. This may be primarily due to better integration at these schools.

BEST COPY

In short, it is speculated that three possible factors are significant in minority recruitment: geographic location of the institution (Miller, Carr, and Sedlacek), recruitment activities, and better integration (Puttkammer).

"Most students who apply are academically qualified to do the work. We select those who will make the most of the educational opportunities at our institution." This is a line that the author still remembers from college-night. Obviously, the Ivies are very selective overall, but how selective are they in accepting minority students? Are they bending their standards just a bit to achieve a diverse student body? The consequence of Bakke case forbids "quota reservation of places for minority applicants without comparison with other applicants."[15] Then why do a higher proportion of minority students (from the minority pool) get into the Ivies than do non-minority students? It is suspected that those minorities who do apply are highly motivated students with a positive attitude toward higher education. However, with more minority students vying for admissions, the selection process has become more difficult. This increase in applications can perhaps explain the decline in the proportion of minorities accepted relative to minorities applied.

Although the proportion of minorities in the total applicant pool is increasing steadly (but slowly), the relative representation of minorities in the acceptance pool seems to have reached a plateau as we enter the 80's.[16] In Sedlacek's study, the plateau was at about 5%. In the Ivies the figure is higher.

BEST COPY

The half decade that was considered in the study, we see a leveling off of the percent of minorities in the acceptance figures. Although Harvard currently has the highest rate of minority representation in the acceptance pool, it is suspected that this will change. In the years ahead most of the Ivies will have approximately the same rate of minority representation because more minority students with better economic, social, academic, and emotional support will be vying for admissions to limited spaces at these institutions. Although this similar rate may not be achieved next year or the year after, the tabulated figures suggest this pattern.

If the above is suspected, then why do schools worry about attracting more minorities that will be here eventually anyway. Just as individuals compete for admission, each Ivy college competes with the others to attract top candidates. The matriculation rate shows that certain schools have higher rates in attracting their acceptees to matriculate. If a student is accepted at more than one Ivy school (since there are many already applying to more than one) and will presumablely choose one of the Ivies, he will theoretically choose the institution that attracts him the most. Financial aid is not a consideration since it is given only on a demonstrated need basis. If this student is a minority student, he will be most likely to choose a better integrated school with more social and personal support for minorities as demonstrated through the recruitment. We have already seen the signs of this effect. The earlier analysis

BEST COPY

shows that certain schools attract more minorities than others. In the end colleges will attract minority students at the expense of other league schools. We have also seen that geographic location of the college is not the only factor that minority students consider.

> Although the Ivy Group institutions are similar in many respects, each member institution will continue to make its own independent admissions decisions according to its own particular admissions policy.[16]

Indeed, it is a healthy sign that each institution has its own independent admissions policy to foster uniqueness. The data tables presented earlier are, for the most part, self-explanatory. We can see from the figures that Harvard's minority recruitemnt policy draws a higher proportion of minorities to apply and to matriculate. Having a larger minority applicant pool to choose from, the college has more freedom in selecting its candidates. Therefore, it is inferred that an increase in recruitment causess an increase in minority applications and that an increase in minority applications increases minority representation. Thus, a diverse, integrated student body is achieved.

As a minority student, the author would like to see his institution, Dartmouth, reach the level of minority recruitment already achieved by the six other institutions studied. The success of recruiting program and integration depends not only on

BEST COPY

admissions but also on the undergraduates and graduates off-campus urging and encouraging many qualified minority students to apply for admission.

On the whole, it is noted that the institution with the highest proportion of minorities in applicant pool has the highest rate of minority matriculation. Furthermore, despite a low (more selective) acceptance rate, the highest matriculation rate was observed at Harvard. It is speculated that even though there might be an increase in the number of applications, the acceptance and matriculation rates are approaching a plateau; while the size of the colleges and universities remains constant, the quality of applicants' background is on the rise.

BEST COPY

Endnotes

1. I would like to thank the following people for providing invaluable information: Dean Quirk (Dartmouth), Dean Rogers (Brown), Dr. York (Cornell), Dean Jewett (Harvard), Dean Cummings (Princeton), Dean Stetson (Penn), Dean David (Yale), and the admissions staff at seven institutions participated in the study.

2. _____, "Joint Statement on Common Ivy Group Admissions Procedure," January, 1976.

3. "Joint Ivy Group Statement."

4. Frank Williams, "Admissions Criteria and the Minority Student," Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, (April 1962), 11.

5. Williams, 16.

6. Helen Astin, "Characteristics of Entering Black Freshmen in Predominantly White Institutions: A Normative Report," (November 1977), abstract.

7. W. Sedlacek, "Minority Admissions to Large Universities: A Seven Year National Survey," (1976), Summary, p6.

8. Sedlacek, 6.

9. David Carr, "A Study to Identify Non-Academic Factors which May Positively Affect Influence the Recruitment and Retention of 'Other Race' Students at Virginia's State Supported Institutions of Higher Education, Final Report," (August 1979), 45.

10. Charles Puttkammer, "Negroes in the Ivy League," (1962), 9.

11. The four common minority groups recruited in the Ivy League are Blacks, Asians, Native Americans, and Hispanics.

12. "Joint Ivy Group Statement."

13. Telephone Interview, Brown Admissions Officer.

14. "Joint Ivy Group Statement."

15. Allan Sindler, Bakke, DeFunis, and Minority Admissions, 1978, 318.

16. Sedlacek, 6.

17. "Joint Ivy Group Statement."

BEST COPY

Bibliography

Books

Goodlad, John I., A Place Called School, R.R. Donnelly and Sons, 1984.

Sindler, Allan P., Bakke, DeFunis, and Minority Admissions, Longman, Inc., New York, 1978.

Articles

Astin, Helen S.; Cross, Patricia H., "Chararacteristics of Entering Freshmen in Predominantly Black and Predominantly White Institutions: A Normative Report," Higher Education Research Inst., Inc., Los Angeles, CA, Nov. 1977. ERIC(Ed.187266)

Carr, David J.; Chittum, Carol, "A Study to Identify Non-Academic Factors Which May Positively Influence the Recruitment and Retention of 'Other Race' Students at Virginia's State Supported Institutions of Higher Educations, Final Report," Aug. 1979. ERIC(Ed.187166)

_____, "Joint Statement on Common Ivy Group Admissions Procedure," January, 1976.

Miller, Robert; and others, "Institutional Characteristics Affecting Minority Admissions and Enrollment Levels at State Universities in Ohio, 1973-1976," National Science Foundation, Wash., D.C., 1977. ERIC(Ed.165691)

Puttkammer, Charles, "Negroes in the Ivy League," A comparison of admissions procedures at six Ivy League schools, 1962. ERIC(Ed.156924)

Sedlacek, W.E.; Pelham, J., "Minority Admissions to Large Universities: A Seven Year National Survey," (Research Report No. 1-76) University of Maryland Counseling Center, College Park, MD 1976.

Williams, Frank; and others, "Admissions Criteria and the Minority Student," Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, v26 n4, p11-16 Apr. 1982.

BEST COPY

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

BEST COPY

Part 1: Minority Recruitment Policy

1. Does _____ recruit ethnic minorities? Y N

2. Does _____ have admissions officers responsible for recruiting ethnic minorities? Y N

3. Please identify the ethnic groups recruited,

_____ recruits:

Blacks	Y	N
Asian Americans	Y	N
Native Americans	Y	N
Hispanics	Y	N
Other (please identify)	Y	N

****

Figures below are actual _____ estimated _____

	Academic years 78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
4. How many applications were completed?					
5. How many applicants were ACCEPTED?					
6. How many of the acceptees MATRICULATE?					
7. How many applicants in 4) were identified as ethnic minority recruits?					
8. How many in 7) were ACCEPTED?					
9. How many in 8) the acceptees MATRICULATE?					
10. What is the ESTIMATED annual admissions BUDGET?					

	Academic years				
	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
11. What is the ESTIMATED annual minority recruiting budget?					

Part 2: Athletic Recruitment Policy

1. Does _____ recruit athletes? Y N

2. Is athletic recruiting handled by the admissions or the athletic department (or council)/

admissions _____

or

athletic dept. _____

****

Figures are actual _____ estimated _____

	Academic years				
	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
3. Of total number of completed applications, how many were identified as athletic recruits?					
4. How many in 3), the athletic recruits were ACCEPTED?					
5. How many of the accepted athletes MATRICULATE?					
6. What is the ESTIMATED annual athletic budget?					
7. What is the ESTIMATED annual athletic recruiting budget?					

BEST COPY

Above questions were answered by

_____

APPENDIX B

"We (columbia) view any information that is relevant to applicant pool in terms of any measureable demographic or other special categories to be highly confidential information. We receive many requests each year to share some or all of this information with a number of individuals and groups with whom we have no on-going professional relationship in this context, we respectfully decline to participate."

James McMenamin
Director of Admissions
Columbia University

**The above message was received over the telephone.

BEST COPY

APPENDIX C

All figures are actual.

Question #4 : How many applications were completed.

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
Brown	11372	11981	11854	11767	13280
Cornell	NA	17007	16988	17923	18208
Dartmouth	7707	8357	8162	8320	7996
Harvard	13085	13851	13513	13341	12537
Princeton	11106	10950	11602	11804	11003
U. of Penn	9833	11268	11367	10571	10518
Yale	10275	10304	10937	11023	9934

Question #5 : How many applicants were accepted?

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
Brown	2674	2537	2577	2625	2690
Cornell	NA	5456	5361	5559	5844
Dartmouth	1839	1879	1849	1845	1786
Harvard	2263	2150	2164	2316	2294
Princeton	2226	2161	2016	2069	2125
Penn	4225	4591	4478	4598	4548
Yale	2298	2130	2186	2189	2162

Question #6 : How many of the acceptees matriculate?

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
Brown	1302	1291	1297	1373	1393
Cornell	NA	2850	2838	2799	2813
Dartmouth	1077	1060	1055	1060	1055
Harvard	1677	1630	1597	1616	1609
Princeton	1148	1210	1141	1154	1168
Penn	2049	2172	2076	2106	2072
Yale	1276	1257	1296	1297	1255

Question #7 : How many applicants in 4) were identified as minorith recruits?

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
Brown	1373	1530	2026	2140	2542
Cornell	2534	2842	3719	3302	3438
Dartmouth	512	481	528	509	482
Harvard	1989	2423	2511	2680	2828
Princeton	1265	1345	1580	1758	1892
Penn	1369	1761	1893	1859	1936
Yale	1059	1160	1371	1265	1368

BEST COPY

APPENDIX C

Question #8 : How many in 7) were accepted?

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
Brown	426	421	485	520	544
Cornell	898	1036	1175	1106	1124
Dartmouth	215	251	212	169	192
Harvard	454	455	492	481	508
Princeton	442	423	395	448	426
Penn	630	706	730	878	841
Yale	410	418	430	398	442

Question #9 : How many in 8) were matriculated?

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
Brown	169	205	216	225	239
Cornell	345	526	611	544	528
Dartmouth	87	111	108	70	93
Harvard	344	347	367	344	339
Princeton	215	171	166	222	184
Penn	267	292	277	353	334
Yale	177	214	225	201	184

BEST COPY